

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

TOWNHOUSES OF CATALPA PHASE I CONDOMINIUMS,	:	Case No. 3:24-cv-00122
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	District Judge Thomas M. Rose
	:	Magistrate Judge Caroline H. Gentry
	:	
vs.	:	
	:	
SCOTTSDALE SURPLUS LINES INSURANCE COMPANY,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

---

---

**NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY AND ORDER**

---

---

This matter is before the Court upon a *sua sponte* review for compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1(a)(2). Defendant Scottsdale Surplus Lines Insurance Company has not filed a diversity disclosure statement as required by that Rule. Defendant is therefore **ORDERED** to file such a statement no later than thirty days from the date of this Order. A sample “Diversity of Citizenship Disclosure Statement” is available on the Court’s website.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Caroline H. Gentry  
Caroline H. Gentry  
United States Magistrate Judge

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), any party may serve and file specific, written objections within FOURTEEN days after being served with this Order. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), this period is extended to SEVENTEEN days if this Order is being

served by one of the methods of service listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), (D), or (F). Such objections shall specify the portions of the Order objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Order is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within FOURTEEN days after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).